

### **REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for total consideration given the present application. Claims 1, 5-8, and 11-12 are currently pending. Claims 1, 11, and 12 are independent. Claims 11 and 12 have been amended through this Reply. Upon careful review one would conclude that no new matter has been added to the application via this amendment. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, and earnestly seek timely allowance of all pending claims.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants appreciate that claims 11 and 12 are indicated to define allowable subject matter.

#### **Specification**

The Specification is objected to for minor informalities. *See Office Action, item 2.* The Specification has been amended to address this objection. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Objection**

Claim 12 stands objected to for minor informalities. This claim has been amended through this Reply to address this issue. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

#### **Rejection Under § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, for allegedly indefinite. Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner that claims 11 and 12 are indefinite, these claims have been amended through this Reply in order to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is required.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 and 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Inoue et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0188373 A1)(“Inoue”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For a Section 102 rejection to be proper, the cited reference must teach or suggest each and every claimed element. *See M.P.E.P. 2131; M.P.E.P. 706.02.* Thus, if the cited reference fails to teach or suggest one or more elements, then the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

In this instance, Inoue fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed element. For example, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein the data processing unit performs: processing for the data indicated by the output of the important component selection unit, updating data stored in the data storage unit whose values are changed by the processing.” *Emphasis added.*

It is respectfully submitted that Inoue fails to teach or suggest the above-identified feature of claim 1.

One of the aspects of the present invention is to provide "a data processing apparatus for performing high-speed digital computer simulation efficiently and at low cost" (*see page 1, lines 7-8 of the Specification*). A conventional calculation method unfortunately requires an almost equal amount of calculation time, between the case for demanding very precise calculation results and the case for undemanding such a precise calculation results (*see page 2, lines 3-13 of the Specification*).

Thus, in order to solve the problems associated with the conventional data processing apparatus, the data processing apparatus according to the present invention comprises a feature of “a data processing unit” that, among other features, processes for the data indicated by the output of the important component selection unit and updates data stored in the data storage unit whose values are changed by the processing.

Thus, it is possible for the data processing apparatus according to the present invention to improve the demerit of the conventional calculation method described above.

In this Office Action, the Examiner relies on paragraph [0114] of Inoue as disclosing the above-identified feature of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's interpretation of the relied upon section of Inoue is totally erroneous. Inoue discloses on paragraph [0114] as follows:

For purposes of discussion, it is assumed that the sub-processing unit SPU1 changed the status of the processor task A to RUNNING, for example, as a result of executing processor task B. As a result, the sub-processing unit SPU1 preferably makes a determination as to whether the priority level of the processor task A is higher than any of the priority levels of the processor tasks running on the other sub-processing units. In this simplified case, the sub-processing unit SPU1 makes a determination as to whether the processor task A is of a higher priority level than the processor task C. If so, the sub-processing unit SP1 at least initiates the replacement of the processor task C with the processor task A. In other words, the sub-processing unit SP1 preferably causes the processor task C to yield the sub-processing unit SPU2 to the processor task A. In this regard, the kernel of the sub-processing unit SPU1 may issue an interrupt to the kernel of the sub-processing unit SPU2. In response to the interrupt, the sub-processing unit SPU2 may write the processor task C back to the shared memory 106 and update the task table (FIG. 24). The sub-processing unit SPU2 may also copy the processor task A from the shared memory to its local memory for execution. (*Emphasis added.*)

Upon careful review of the above-identified section of Inoue, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion of a data processing unit that processes for the data indicated by the output of the important component selection unit and updates data stored in the data storage unit whose values are changed by the processing as recited in claim 1. Rather, as demonstrated above, Inoue merely discloses to change a task status by processing. However, Inoue totally fails to disclose to change values of the task by processing, and to update the task based on the changed values.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is distinguishable from Inoue. Claims 5-8 are distinguishable from Inoue at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 and 5-8, based on Inoue, be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION


All rejections and objections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claims does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ali M. Imam Reg. No. 58,755 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By  # 58,755  
Michael K. Mutter  
Registration No.: 29,680  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant